MOTION FILED
JAN 31 1983

No. 82-195

In The

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

MUELLER, *et al.*,
Petitioners,

— v. —

ALLEN, *et al.*,
Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE AND BRIEF OF THE CATHOLIC LEAGUE FOR RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL RIGHTS, AMICUS CURIAE, IN SUPPORT OF THE RESPONDENTS

CHARLES E. RICE
Notre Dame Law School
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
(219) 239-5257

Counsel of Record for
Amicus Curiae

THOMAS PATRICK MONAGHAN
General Counsel
Catholic League for Religious
and Civil Rights
1100 West Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
(414) 289-0313

Attorney for Amicus Curiae

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE vii

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE 1

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT 1

ARGUMENT - Constitutional Interpretation of the First Amendment and Public Policy Goals of Educational Development for the Poor and Minorities, for Racial Integration, and for a Fair Tax Policy Would be Threatened by Disallowing the Minnesota General Tax Deduction for Educational Expenses as Unconstitutional 3

A. The Inner City Non-State Schools: A Stepping Stone for Minorities 4

B. The Egalitarian Nature of Inner City Non-State Schools Promotes Racial and Social Integration 6

Page

C. Minority Families Make Painful Financial Sacrifices in Order to Send Their Children to Inner City Non-State Schools 11

D. Minnesota's Tax Deduction Program for Educational Expenses Serves the Public Interest in a Constitutional Manner 14

CONCLUSION 20

APPENDIX A - Frequency of Acceptance of Problem Pupils in Target Inner City Private Schools 22

APPENDIX B - Annual Family Income and Annual Tuition Costs of Families In Target Inner-City Private Schools 23

APPENDIX C - Parental Responses on "Private School Quality" 24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases Cited — *Page(s)*

Board of Education v. Allen, 392 U.S. 236 (1968) 3

Committee for Public Education v. Nyquist, 413 U.S. 756 (1973) 16,18,19

Mueller v. Allen, 676 F.2d 1995 (1982) 3

Walz v. Tax Commission, 397 U.S. 664 (1970) 15-16,17,19

Statutory Provision

Minnesota Statute § 290.09, subdivision 22 3,4,8,11,14,16,18,19

Other Authorities

Amicus Curiae Brief of the Counsel for Minnesota Association of School Administrators, et al. 17

Amicus Curiae Brief of the Mountain States Legal Foundation, et al. 17

Page(s)

Amicus Curiae Brief of the National School Boards Association 17

The Black Silence of Fear, The New York Times Magazine, Jan. 13, 1952, at 7 20

Blum, Why Inner City Families Send Their Children to Private Schools: An Empirical Study, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties, (E. Gaffney, Jr., ed. 1981) 15

Brief of Commissioner Clyde E. Allen, Jr., Appendix A and B--Distribution of Dependent Expenditures by Size, Minnesota Department of Revenue, Oct. 28, 1982 19-20

Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights: J. Cibulka, T. O'Brien, and D. Zewe, Inner City Private Elementary Schools: A Study (1982) 5,6,7,9,10,11,13

Page(s)

Coleman, Public Schools, Private Schools and the Public Interest, Am. Educ., Jan.-Feb. 1982, at 17 (A synopsis of the Coleman-Hoffer-Kilgore Report Public and Private Schools (PPS) 1981) 7,8,9

Giannella, Religious Liberty, Non-establishment, and Doctrinal Development; Part II--The Non-establishment Principle, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 513 (1968) 16

Graham, Joining the Discussion: Tuition Tax Credits, Am. Educ., July 1982, at 13 8

Greeley, Catholic High Schools and Minority Students, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties 6 (E. Gaffney, Jr., ed. 1981) 8

R. M. MacIver, The Web of Government 411 (1949) 20

Page(s)

Reed, Introduction, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties 3-5 (E. Gaffney, Jr., ed. 1981) 17-18

Sowell, Tuition Tax Credits: A Social Revolution, Am. Educ., July 1982, at 18-19 14-15

Taylor, The St. Thomas Community School: A Harlem Success Story, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties 44 (E. Gaffney, Jr., ed. 1981) 13

Vitullo-Martin, How Federal Policies Discourage the Racial and Economic Integration of Private Schools, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties 25 (E. Gaffney, Jr., ed. 1981) 8

MOTION OF THE CATHOLIC LEAGUE FOR RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL RIGHTS FOR LEAVE TO FILE A BRIEF AMICUS CURIAE

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights respectfully moves this Court, pursuant to Rule 36.3 of its rules, for leave to file the accompanying brief *amicus curiae* in support of respondents in *Mueller* v. *Allen*, No. 82-195.

The consent of the parties to the filing of the attached brief has been sought by the moving party. Consent has not been received. *Amicus*, accordingly, proceeds under Rule 36.3.

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights is a civil rights organization national in membership that is concerned with the civil and religious rights of parents in the education of their children, and in particular with the rights of minority parents in educating their children.

The League, in furtherance of these goals, has conducted studies of the inner city non-state schools and advanced their interests in public and non-public forums.

It is the position of *amicus* that the value and true view of these schools is being overlooked and that

these schools and the parents who support them are at risk in the case at bar; that the interests of these minority families across the nation will not be presented to the Court unless this brief *amicus curiae* is considered by this Court.

Therefore, *amicus* prays this Court grant this motion and consider its accompanying brief which gives the bases and arguments for its support of respondents' position.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles E. Rice
Notre Dame Law School
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
(219) 239-5667
Counsel of Record for Amicus Curiae

Thomas Patrick Monaghan
General Counsel
Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights
1100 West Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
(414) 289-0170
Attorney for Amicus Curiae

BRIEF OF THE CATHOLIC LEAGUE FOR RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL RIGHTS AS AMICUS CURIAE

INTEREST OF THE AMICUS CURIAE

The interest of The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights as amicus curiae in this matter, is set forth in the Motion for Leave to File a Brief Amicus Curiae.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Minnesota's tax deduction program for educational expenses is a general tax deduction for individuals, not a subsidy to individuals or institutions, and thereby it serves the public interest in quality education for minority children, indeed all children, in a constitutional manner.

Non-state schools are egalitarian and provide minorities a stepping stone out of poverty by furnishing quality education and promoting racial and social integration. The non-state schools, particularly those located in the inner city, embrace the children of this nation's minorities and teach them how to make their way in an educated and affluent country. These schools embody egalitarianism in their very nature and in a

proper and productive sense they impart self-esteem and pride to the minority and ethnic children who attend them. The "partnership" between state and non-state schools sought by true educators who are concerned for the welfare of children is furthered by Minnesota's legislation.

Minnesota's tax deduction for educational expenses is constitutional, just as all charitable and religious tax deductions and health care tax deductions for individuals for services rendered by religious affiliated concerns are constitutional.

ARGUMENT

Constitutional Interpretation of the First Amendment and Public Policy Goals of Educational Development for the Poor and Minorities, for Racial Integration, and for a Fair Tax Policy Would be Threatened by Disallowing the Minnesota General Tax Deduction for Educational Expenses as Unconstitutional.

The State of Minnesota, in the enactment of its education expense tax deduction legislation, is rightfully making a policy decision to promote education--state and non-state. That is the principal and primary effect of this legislation. "Private education has played and is playing a significant and valuable role in raising national levels of knowledge, competence, and experience," *Board of Education* v. *Allen*, 392 U.S. 236, 247 (1968). It would be absurd to allow tax deductions for expenses relative to maintaining real estate or advancing one's career and not to allow a similar deduction for an investment in the education of children.

The 8th Circuit in *Mueller* v. *Allen*, 676 F.2d 1995 (1982), upheld § 290.09, subdivision 22 of the Minnesota Statutes, authorizing a deduction to gross income for tuition, textbook, and transportation expenses incurred on behalf of dependents attending state and non-state elementary or secondary schools. The deduction is limited to actual expenses incurred up to a $500 maximum per dependent in grades K to 6 and a $700 maximum per dependent in grades 7 to 12.

Deductible expenses are limited to families whose children attend schools which comply with state compulsory attendance laws and are racially non-discriminatory.

A. The Inner City Non-State Schools: A Stepping Stone for Minorities

The emergence of inner city non-state schools as islands of hope in the poorest areas of the nation's urban landscape may be one of the most remarkable phenomena in the history of modern urban education. These schools, though their very existence is precarious, have remained in the hearts of the American cities, embracing and serving generations of minority group children--the children of wave after wave of immigrants struggling to make their way in an alien country. With minuscule resources, these schools have undertaken tasks that have daunted and defeated many educators in the state sector. They are a vital alternative to the state sector, providing quality education to those groups most desperately in need of a way to break out of the vicious and seemingly endless cycle of illiteracy, unemployability and welfare dependency.

The record of these inner city non-state schools, which have been too long ignored and neglected, amounts to little less than a miracle in the heart of our central cities.

The First Amendment has been the cornerstone of our individual rights and freedoms, whose benefits run to all members of our society. To now use that amendment to invalidate the Minnesota statute in question would

be to turn the Religion Clauses on their heads and apply them in a fashion that would allow tax deductions for day care but not for schooling. Doing so certainly would not benefit our nation's children.

An education research project by the Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights: J. Cibulka, T. O'Brien, and D. Zewe, *Inner City Private Elementary Schools: A Study* (1982) [hereinafter cited as *Inner City*] proves that those at the low end of the socio-economic ladder who seek non-state education do so with the desire of having their children receive *quality education.* A critique of the study will show that for this Court to invalidate legislation such as Minnesota's for other states, is to compel many inner city children to attend inferior and *de facto* segregated school facilities.

The 1978-79 study focuses on non-state inner city schools that have a large percentage of minority representation. In the 54 schools targeted for study, blacks comprised 56% of the children. The second largest group was Hispanics, who made up 31%. Whites accounted for 8% of the total enrollment, while other ethnic groups accounted for 5% of the enrollment. *Inner City* at 32.

The Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights initiated the *Inner City* study to ascertain who these families are and why they make the sacrifices entailed in sending their children to non-state schools. The study was made in 54 randomly selected inner-city schools in eight cities: Los Angeles, New Orleans, Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, New York, Newark and Washington, D.C. The 54 responding elementary schools

serve a total enrollment of 15,312, of whom at least 70 percent are members of racial and ethnic minorities.

The elementary schools, which have an average enrollment of 278 children, are heavily dependent on lay teachers, with only 30 percent of their teachers being religious men and women. *Inner City* at 102. The schools operate under open admissions policies. The expulsion of children is rare, but sometimes students are advised to transfer to a school where more adequate counseling is available. *Inner City* at 142.

The *Inner City* study examines the attitudes of about 4,000 elementary school parents, 339 teachers and 50 principals who responded to the survey. The information provided by the parents reveals who they are (their religion and ethnicity, their economic status, their educational level, their family structure), their perceptions of inner-city schools and, most importantly, their perceptions of the kind of education their children are receiving in these inner-city non-state schools.

B. The Egalitarian Nature of Inner City Non-State Schools Promotes Racial and Social Integration

One of the findings of the *Inner City* study is that although the schools themselves are overwhelmingly Catholic in their affiliation, nearly one-third--31 percent--of the students are Protestants, while 2 percent listed themselves as having no church membership. *Inner City* at 51. Among blacks, however, the proportion of non-Catholics is even higher--with 53

percent reporting that they are Protestant. The vast majority of whites and Hispanics are Catholics.

The egalitarian nature of non-tax-supported schools is evidenced by the way they select and maintain student bodies through admissions and expulsions. According to the study, inner city non-state schools show only a modest propensity toward any admission selectivity and almost no selectivity through expulsions. Rather, by emphasizing socialization, the schools create a distinctive educational environment. *Inner City* at 142.

According to James A. Coleman, in *Public Schools, Private Schools and the Public Interest*, Am. Educ., Jan.-Feb. 1982, at 17 (A synopsis of the Coleman-Hoffer-Kilgore Report *Public and Private Schools* (PPS) 1981) [hereinafter cited as Coleman], tax funded schools are themselves not perfectly integrated in these economic and racial dimensions, and there is already social self-selection within the population when people choose where to live. The question is whether the educational system as it now stands, containing non-state schools, is more segregated along racial grounds than would be a system without non-state schools.

In regard to racial segregation there is a substantial difference between the proportion of blacks in the state sector, the Catholic sector and the other non-state sector; Coleman uses the figures of 14, 6, and 3 percent, respectively. Coleman at 20. Yet, *within* the individual schools in the tax funded state sector, segregation is much higher than the black-white segregation within either of the non-state sectors or in the

total non-state sector combined! Internally the non-state schools are less segregated. Coleman concludes: "If whites and blacks now in private schools were redistributed into the public sector in just the way whites and blacks are now distributed in that sector, there would be no greater and no less segregation than currently exists. Coleman at 21.

Integration is encouraged and achieved through the parents' desires for quality education and for religious and moral instruction. These parental goals find fruition in the non-state schools and result in the enhancement of voluntary social integration. *See* Greeley, *Catholic High Schools and Minority Students*, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties 6 (E. Gaffney, Jr., ed. 1981). This social integration is being achieved despite federal disincentives. *See* Vitullo-Martin, *How Federal Policies Discourage the Racial and Economic Integration of Private Schools*, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties, *supra* at 25.

Legislation similar to the challenged Minnesota Statute actually promotes racial desegregation not only in education but in other areas of life as well. With higher quality education available in the cities, middle-class, predominantly white families will have reduced incentives to flee to the suburbs as a way of insuring good education for their children. *See* Graham, *Joining the Discussion: Tuition Tax Credits*, Am. Educ., July 1982, at 13.

Obviously, given their restricted resources, the non-state schools cannot be "all things to all people,"

but according to the *Inner City* study, schools can be distinctive without being exclusive. *Inner City* at 145.

Of course religious affiliation obviously should not be treated as an exclusionary policy. The *Inner City* study showed that even though most of the schools in the study were church-affiliated, the schools were almost evenly split on the matter of giving preference to children with a certain religious affiliation. *Inner City* at 136. This was true for first time enrollees and for transfers from state schools.

Leaving aside the question of religious affiliation, other selection criteria were the parents' motivation, the child's academic ability, the child's behavior, and the perceived motivation of the child. Furthermore, *roughly one-fourth of the schools in the survey used no admissions criteria whatever.* *Inner City* at 136, 137.

The study also found that these inner city non-state schools opened their doors to state school transfers, even in cases where the transfers were clearly not the most desirable or ideal students. *Inner City* at 140. In fact, 35 percent of the schools give no tests in accepting transfer children but simply place the children and work with them. *Inner City* at 141. The schools that do test rarely reject applicants, even though only 6 percent test the same as their peers in the school they are entering. Differences in educational level can be remedied and are remedied in the non-state schools, as the Coleman Report shows. Coleman at 19.

The survey found that a vast majority (80 percent) of the schools reported that they accepted academically weak state school transfers frequently or sometimes. This tendency was less pronounced among pupils with discipline problems, but a majority (56 percent) of the schools reported they accepted such transfers frequently or sometimes. *Inner City* at 139, 140. *See also* table in Appendix A from *Inner City* at 140.

This evidence--that non-state schools often accept pupils with learning or disciplinary problems--demonstrates that the schools are egalitarian rather than elitist institutions. Further, it is evident from the testing results that these schools do not view a child as "academically weak" simply because he may test below grade level. This democratic openness to environmental differences by the schools may account for the positive enthusiasm and sacrifices of the parents--95 percent of whom feel their "opinion matters." Similarly, 98 percent of the parents report that their child talks positively about their schooling--77 percent of the parents make this statement of a positive attitude from their children "strongly." *Inner City* at 144, 152.

The data of the study indicate that parental motivation is the criterion foremost in the minds of school officials, both for first time enrollees and for state school transfers. This suggests that in their admission decisions, officials are concerned primarily with responding to parental concerns and desires for quality education.

C. Minority Families Make Painful Financial Sacrifices in Order to Send Their Children to Inner City Non-State Schools

The deep commitment of minority families to quality education is clearly demonstrated by the sacrifices entailed in their choice of inner city non-state schools. Fifteen percent of the responding families report annual incomes of less than $5,000; another 35 percent report incomes of from $5,000 to $10,000; 22 percent report incomes of from $10,000 to $15,000; 14 percent report incomes from $15,000 to $20,000; and another 14 percent report incomes over $20,000. *Inner City* at 34.

It is noteworthy that 72 percent of families with children in inner city non-state schools report annual incomes of less than $15,000. This constitutes an over-representation of low income families, since only 36 percent of all U.S. families have incomes of less than $15,000. More remarkable still is the fact that 50 percent of inner city non-state school families live on less than $10,000 a year, in contrast to 27 percent of all U.S. families. All but 14 percent of the respondents are members of families whose annual income was below the median income of U.S. families, which was just under $20,000 in 1978. Their income level, in relationship to annual tuition costs, is reflected in the table in Appendix B, from *Inner City* at 38.

One of the misrepresentations by opponents of the challenged Minnesota legislation is that it would cost millions of dollars. What is economically important is that a shift of students to lower-cost non-state

schools can save millions of dollars for society as a whole.

Many non-state schools educate youngsters at costs that are only a small fraction of the cost of state schools. Many non-state schools charge an annual tuition of $600, and the study found a mean tuition rate of $400 for inner city non-state schools. On the other hand, the per child cost of education in some metropolitan school systems approaches $3,000. Old or new mathematics tells us that if we *reduce* the number of children receiving a $3,000 per year state education and *increase* the number of children receiving a $600 high-quality non-state education, the nation as a whole will benefit by reduced educational expenditures and the provision of better educational opportunities.

One of the greatest degradations of poverty is the unavailability of educational choice. Most poor parents in America are suffering that degradation. In the education of their children they have no choice of religious and moral values, no choice of educational environment, no choice to assure dedicated and committed teachers, no choice of personal involvement in the education of their children. The state through its truancy laws forcibly compels parents to send their children to schools, but effectively denies to the poor any choice of school because, generally, family financial limitations make state-operated schooling the only available option. This amounts, in effect, to a compulsory government monopoly in the education of low-income children. The net result is that parental involvement remains only theoretical for most poor people.

Why, then, do many of these poor and powerless parents send their children to inner city non-state schools in old dilapidated buildings, to schools with inadequate facilities and equipment, to schools with teachers grossly underpaid, and in which they themselves are expected to contribute labor and services? In the *Inner City* study, minority parents answered that question in a voice that was virtually unanimous. They send their children to these inner city non-state schools because they want a better education, a quality education for their children. *Inner City* at 10. By quality education, they mean an education that includes religious and moral values, an education with rules and discipline, an education that treats their children with respect, an education provided by teachers and staff who care about their students and the students' self-image, and impress on them high levels of expectation, an education to which they themselves contribute labor and services, an education that makes their children so interested in learning that they discuss school at the dinner table. *See* Appendix C table on parental responses on school quality, from *Inner City* at 63. *See also* Taylor, *The St. Thomas Community School: A Harlem Success Story*, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties, *supra* at 44.

D. Minnesota's Tax Deduction Program for Educational Expenses Serves the Public Interest in a Constitutional Manner

These inner city non-state schools are one of the truly remarkable developments in American education, and, if given encouragement and time, will become a potent force for the betterment of our society. These schools, structured in order to meet the special needs and aspirations of the individuals who populate the battered and often violent neighborhoods of this nation's central cities, are signs of hope to a near despairing people. Such schools, through the market mechanism of competition, improve the educational quality provided to our children. The Minnesota legislation aids the quality development of all schools.

> Public schools in affluent neighborhoods where parents already have that option [of sending their children to non-state schools] must pay some attention to those parents' wishes and be responsive. But parents in poorer neighborhoods and ghettos have no such leverage to use to get attention, response, or even common courtesy. The mere prospect of being able to remove their children to private schools changes all that. In other words, the benefits of the availability of a tuition tax credit do not end with those who take advantage of it but extend to those who keep their children in the public schools and never collect a dime from the Treasury--but whose

> children's needs now have to be taken seriously by public school officials no longer insulated or assured of a captive audience. Sowell, *Tuition Tax Credits: A Social Revolution*, Am. Educ., July 1982, at 18-19.

Minority parents rightly feel that they have been discriminated against because of their color or ethnicity. Although the battle for civil rights for minorities in the 1960's has changed much of that, the right of meaningful educational choice for minorities is still to be won. State and federal tax policies have severely damaged the inner cities. Moreover, governments have persistently denied education tax funds to parents who choose high quality private schools for their children's education.

In defense of their fundamental rights in education, minority parents are today beginning to protest this denial of education tax funds. Minority parents overwhelmingly support government programs that would assist them in providing for the education of their children in schools of their choice. Blum, *Why Inner City Families Send Their Children To Private Schools: An Empirical Study*, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties, *supra*, 17, 24.

Now, in the Supreme Court, petitioners are asking that *even* a tax deduction not be allowed to these parents who sacrifice so that their children be educated--even though this Court has recognized that obviously a tax exemption is "qualitatively different" from a subsidy. *Walz v. Tax Commission*, 397 U.S. 664,

689 (1970) (Brennan, J., concurring); *Committee for Public Education* v. *Nyquist*, 413 U.S. 756 (1973). *See also* Giannella, *Religious Liberty, Nonestablishment, and Doctrinal Development; Part II—The Nonestablishment Principle*, 81 Harv. L. Rev. 513 (1968) for a well-done summary of the differences between a tax deduction and subsidy, wherein he observes, "The [tax] deduction is not structured to encourage contributions to religion . . ." *Id.* at 549.

Parents who exercise education choices should not be penalized. Indeed if such educational deductions are claimed to be unconstitutional, what then is the status of all charitable and educational deductions? A tax deduction *is* a policy decision *not* to transfer some wealth from the individual to the state. A tax deduction is not a subsidy collected from all and then distributed to smaller sub-parts. In a subsidy, there is an active movement of funds; in a deduction there is the passive maintenance of the status quo.

In fact, no individual can even claim harm unless it is assumed that the state has an interest in all the productive wealth generated by its people. The fact that the state, through its taxing powers, may take certain assets into its coffers, does not establish that the state owns or controls everything that is potentially taxable. Not to distinguish between the two is to say "Render unto Caesar everything, and be thankful for what he deems to return."

It is these critical differences which distinguish a tax deduction from a direct grant and which hurdle the Minnesota legislation over the serpentine wall of the First Amendment which divides impermissible state

encouragement of religion from permissible benevolent neutrality. As the Court stated in *Walz*, 397 U.S. at 677, "There is no genuine nexus between tax exemption and establishment of religion."

The State of Minnesota is merely making a policy decision to promote education--state and non-state. That is the principal and primary effect of this legislation. Similarly, the bettering of education for our nation's children, not internecine legal battles over turf or economic philosophies, should be the principle by which all are guided in this litigation. It is unfortunate that acrimonious charges and countercharges emanating from various sources have generated more heat than light. *See* amicus curiae briefs of the Counsel for Minnesota Association of School Administrators, et al., the Mountain States Legal Foundation, et al., and the National School Boards Association. No one need fear that a tax deduction for education will create an incentive causing a massive student exodus from state schools to non-state schools, because even with a deduction, non-state school parents will *still* have out-of-pocket expenses greater than their permissible tax deduction.

The overarching national goal of promoting quality education--both state and non-state--is mirrored in the statements of the Hon. Vincent E. Reed, past Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public schools. He states, and all would do well to heed his advice, that:

> If the financial exigency that we experienced in the District of Columbia is symptomatic of

> other public school systems and of many areas of private schools, then it seems to make sense that public education and private education get together somehow to maximize scarce resources in order to make sure that quality education remains possible in this country. In order to achieve the goal of quality education for all, the public sector and the private sector need to enter into a partnership to strengthen one another. . . . My basic feeling is that educators are paid to serve young people and all of us should do that in a combined way so that our young people will be served and will develop no matter where the service comes from. . . . There is much that each sector can learn from the other. Both need to survive, and neither can neglect the other much longer. . . . If such a marriage of minds and energies can be achieved, the children of America will be the winners. Reed, *Introduction*, in Private Schools and the Public Good--Policy Alternatives for the Eighties, *supra* at 3-5.

Nyquist clearly does not stand for the proposition that such an educationally sound and wise policy of "partnership" and cooperation between the sectors is unconstitutional. This "partnership" inherent within the challenged Minnesota tax deduction is exactly the type of benevolent neutrality that Chief Justice Burger had in mind when he stated:

> We will not tolerate either governmentally established religion or governmental interference with religion. Short of those expressly proscribed governmental acts there is room for play in the joints productive of a benevolent neutrality which will permit religious exercise to exist without sponsorship and without interference. *Walz*, 397 U.S. at 669.

Again, it must be asked, if Minnesota's across the board educational deduction is to be held unconstitutional, when will all other educational and charitable deductions be declared unconstitutional as well?

The Minnesota statute is a "general" tax benefit for *all* parents who incur educational expenditures, and is in no way "special tax benefits." *Nyquist*, 413 U.S. at 794. Thus, just as *Nyquist* specifically and correctly exempted from its holding a genuine tax deduction, so the Minnesota legislature acted constitutionally in granting a tax deduction for educational costs, as well as for dental and medical care, which are certainly in some instances also provided by religious and charitable institutions.

Indeed, as budgetary constraints increase for all schools and by necessity funding for all programs is cut back, the use of the education deduction will increase and will become more important for parents whose children attend tax funded state schools. This trend is confirmed by the enhanced use of "user fees" in the state schools to help cover the costs of extracurricular activities and other programs. *See Distri-*

bution of Dependent Expenditures by Size, Minnesota Department of Revenue, Oct. 28, 1982, Appendix A and B of Commissioner Clyde E. Allen, Jr.'s brief.

CONCLUSION

"Our real power," Justice Douglas observed, "is our spiritual strength, and that spiritual strength stems from our civil liberties. If we are true to our traditions, if we are tolerant of a whole market place of ideas, we will always be strong." *The Black Silence of Fear*, The New York Times Magazine, Jan. 13, 1952, at 7, 38.

If we are "tolerant of a whole market place of ideas," we must be tolerant of a diversity of schools, and if we are tolerant of a diversity of schools, we may not individually discriminate against parents and students who pursue quality education in schools of their choice. It would be most tragic for the Constitution to be used as a solvent to weaken a society's bond and dampen the dreams of thousands of parents who seek a better world for their children through better education. A policy which promotes education exclusively by the state potentially plows the furrow for a man who can live exclusively for the state. Such a man, according to R. M. MacIver, is "either a tyrant or a slave." R. M. MacIver, *The Web of Government*, 411 (1949).

For the foregoing reasons, the judgment and opinion of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit should be upheld.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles E. Rice
Notre Dame Law School
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Indiana 46556
(219) 239-5667
Counsel of Record for Amicus Curiae

Thomas Patrick Monaghan
General Counsel
Catholic League for Religious and Civil Rights
1100 West Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53223
(414) 289-0170
Attorney for Amicus Curiae

APPENDIX A

FREQUENCY OF ACCEPTANCE OF PROBLEM PUPILS IN TARGET INNER-CITY PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Acceptance	Kind of "Problem" Pupil	
How Often	Academically Weak Transfers	Discipline-Problem Transfers
Frequently	32%	6%
Sometimes	48	50
Seldom	14	30
Never	6	14

n = 50 Missing data on 4 schools.

APPENDIX B

ANNUAL FAMILY INCOME AND ANNUAL TUITION COSTS OF FAMILIES IN TARGET INNER-CITY PRIVATE SCHOOLS

Tuition	Annual Income of Families				Totals
	Under $5,000	$5,000-$9,999	$10,000-$14,999	$15,000 and up	
Under $300	37%	19%	14%	13%	18% (644)
$301-$499	38	47	42	33	42 (1511)
$500 and up	25	34	44	54	41 (1469)
Total	100%	100%	100%	100%	101%[1]
	(544)	(1257)	(792)	(1031)	(3624)
	15%	35%	22%	28%	100/101%

n = 3995 minus 371 missing cases.

1 Total is greater than 100% due to rounding.

$X^2 = 244.17$ at df = 6. Significant at greater than .01 level of significance.

APPENDIX C

PARENTAL RESPONSES ON "PRIVATE SCHOOL QUALITY"

Question No. and Statement	Percent Responding[1]			
	Strongly Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Strongly Disagree
35. This school is giving my child a quality education.	53%	41%	6%	0.3%
56. I am confident that I am sending my child to the school that will best educate him/her.	80	18	2	0.4
58. Going to this school will help my child be more successful in the future.	74	24	1	1
40. The attitudes of teachers here, the involvement of parents with the school, the concern for the student has made my child more interested in learning.	67	30	2	1
37. At this school, my child has learned to read and write well.	72	26	2	1
42. This school challenges my child to do his/her best.	80	18	1	1
26. When my child's teacher or principal tells me my child needs to be disciplined, I trust their judgment.	51	43	5	1
36. The people at this school are concerned about my child's personal image.	71	26	2	1
25. After coming to this school, my child's behavior at home has:..[2]	37	33	29	1

1 Adjusted for missing cases. Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.

2 The four response choices were "greatly improved", "somewhat improved", "not changed", and "become worse".